## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 11-23 remain in the application. Claims 11-23 have been amended. Claims 1-10 had been previously canceled.

With reference to the drawing objection, enclosed herewith is a proposed correction for Fig. 1 in which we have labeled the figure “Prior Art.”

The specification has been amended in response to the Examiner’s objection. All references to the numbered claims have been replaced with the corresponding language from the originally filed specification (i.e., the literally translated text).

Claims 11 and 17 have been amended to replace the acronyms EMC and SMD with corresponding terminology. Also, the expressions “high-frequency signals” and “high resistance” have been deleted from claim 11. All of the claims have been amended, furthermore, to remove the parenthetical expressions with the reference numerals.

The specification and the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved.

We now turn to the art rejection, in which claims 11 and 13-15 have been rejected as being anticipated by Lee (US 5,997,267) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. We respectfully traverse.

Lee describes a cooling fan for a computer. In order to prevent magnetic flux lines to exit the assembly and to interfere with other devices in the computer, the stator is encased within a magnetically conductive enclosure. A multilayer printed circuit board is disposed on top of the stator of the drive motor. One of the layers of the printed circuit board is grounded, so that electromagnetic radiation generated in the motor cannot escape the housing. Electromagnetic interference which would travel through the supply lines is shielded by a copper-wound ferrite core on the printed circuit board.

Lee's cooling fan is driven with a set speed and torque as defined by the supply voltage fed through the supply lines 61. Lee's cooling fan does not have a control circuit on the printed circuit board for controlling the operation of the motor. Specifically, there is no need in Lee's cooling fan assembly to control the speed and/or the torque of the motor.

Claim 11 of the instant application requires that an attenuation element be provided for attenuating electromagnetic interference signal, that the element contain ferrite material, and that the element be disposed on a printed circuit board that also carries a control circuit for controlling the d.c. motor.

Lee does not have an EMI attenuation element on a printed circuit board together with a control circuit for controlling the motor. Accordingly, Lee does not anticipate the invention defined in claim 11.

We now turn to the art rejection in which claims 11-23 have been rejected as being obvious over Haag et al. (US 6,232,684, hereinafter "Haag") in view of Parker (US 5,896,079) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. We respectfully traverse.

The primary reference Haag describes a rear deck lid actuator that is driven with a d.c. motor. A clamshell-type housing is configured to prevent EMI radiation to escape and interfere with other components in the vehicle. Electromagnetic interference signals through conduction are prevented with a filter that is connected in the supply circuit for the motor. The filter consist of two inductors (ferrite chips 78, 80) in the positive lead and a capacitor 82 connecting an node between the inductors to the ground lead.

The filter components 78, 80, 82 are mounted on a printed circuit board 84 which is inserted in the housing in close vicinity of the motor. The printed circuit board 84 does not appear to carry any other elements. It clearly does not carry a control circuit for controlling the d.c. motor. In fact, Haag does not contain any description relating to a control circuit. Considering the fact that the leads 48 ("decklid ajar") and 50 ("interior decklid") carry indicator signals from the assembly to the vehicle control system, it would appear that any control circuit for controlling the motor would be located outside of the assembly housing. Accordingly, Haag does not

suggest placing the inductors on a circuit board together with a control circuit for controlling the motor.

The secondary reference Parker is acknowledged. There, common mode ferrite beads are described that are suitable for high-frequency applications. Parker does not modify the primary reference Haag with regard to the placement of the interference signal suppressing elements. That is, Parker does not suggest placing a ferrite material attenuation element on a printed circuit board together with a control circuit for controlling a d.c. motor.

In summary, none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 11 or 23. These claims are, therefore, patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are dependent on claim 11, they are patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-23 are solicited.

/Werner H. Stemer/
Werner H. Stemer
(Reg. No. 34,956)

WHS:lq - May 22, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: 954·925·1100
Fax: 954·925·1101